

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to FIG. 11, 12, 14 and 15, updated to have all reference numbers having lines drawn to the area being referenced. All other attached sheets of drawings submitted herewith have no changes.

Attachment: Two (2) Replacement Sheets, updated FIG 11, 12 & FIG 14,15.

REMARKS

The examiner is courteously thanked for noting the claim numbering error. Correction has been made by amendment.

Claim 15 stands rejected on Harris in view of Fedor. The frame of Harris is comparable to that of claim 15, however, there is no motivation in the prior art to modify the Harris frame in the manner of Fedor, in fact, the two structures are essentially incompatible. Fedor uses an upper rectangular frame and a lower rectangular frame, each of which are designed to interact with a mounting member. The Fedor structure relies on the top frame member to carry the weight of the aquarium. The support capacity is dependant upon the bonding between the glass and the top frame. It is not readily apparent how, or why anyone would modify the Harris structure in view of Fedor, or why one would make such a modification.

By way of contrast, the structure of claim 15 distributes the weight bearing to the entire frame and most importantly, the bottom frame can carry the weight of the water.

Claims 18 and 19 stand rejected on Harris in view of Fedor and further in view of Lin. It is simply not understood why one skilled in the art would look to a sliding window art for a feature to be used in an aquarium. Further clarification is respectfully requested. In the absence of any motivation to combine the Lin structure with that of Harris, Fedor, or a combination thereof, no further remarks are considered to be necessary.

Claim 20 is rejected on Harris and Newman as applied to claim 15, in further view of Fedor, and accordingly applicant's remarks made with respect to claim 15 are applicable to this rejection. The Newman structure might work with small aquariums but is inapplicable to large aquariums. Claim 20 calls for a system in which the structural metal frame can be secured to the mounting rail by means of a plurality of threaded rods fixed at one end to one of said mounting rails and affixed with a pair of opposing nuts to the structural metal frame. Newman not only does not provide for this type of mounting structure but cannot be modified to provide for the heavy duty mounting system of the claim.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding the present response, the Examiner is invited to contact Sheldon H. Parker directly at 703-563-2041.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance, and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Sheldon H. Parker
Reg. No. 20,738

JAGTIANI + GUTTAG
Democracy Square Business Center
10363-A Democracy Lane
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
703-591-2664

December 28, 2005